

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

06:43:28 p.m.

01-09-2007

9/12

JAN 09 2007

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17676

Application No.: 10/689,877

Page 6

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20-25 remain pending. Claims 7, 15, and 19 have been canceled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 8, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Long et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0144175); rejected claims 2, 7, 15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long et al. in view of Smith et al. (US Patent No. 6,599,194); rejected claims 6 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long et al. in view of Joyner et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0033555); rejected claims 21-24¹ under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuliani et al. (WO 97/65432) in view of Sony (DIRECTV Receiver, page 8); and rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuliani et al. in view of Sony and further in view of Perlman (US Pub. No. 2004/0110466).

Regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 16, before amendment all of these claims required receiving information "from a remote program." Page 2 of the Office Action points to memory 24 as allegedly containing the claimed "remote program." Logically, system 20 cannot contain a program that is "remote" in any real sense from one of its subsystems 26. In practice, all of Fig. 3 of Long et al. would be found within the same enclosure, and thus Long et al. does not reasonably disclose "receiving . . . information . . . from a remote program" as set forth in claims 1, 8 and 16 prior to amendment.

Notwithstanding the above, and to avoid further protracting prosecution, Applicants have amended claims to further emphasize the remoteness of the previously-claimed remote programs, and to further clarify the specific subject matter for which protection is sought. Claim 1, as amended, requires a method including, *inter alia*, "receiving video information at a first apparatus from a remote video game program in a second apparatus that is remote and spaced apart from the first apparatus over a first bidirectional communication link." Claim 8, as amended, requires an apparatus including, *inter alia*, "a first bidirectional communication

¹ Paragraph 14 on page 6 of the Office Action presumably meant to stop at claim 24, because of the presence of the separate rejection of claim 25 over the additional reference Perlman on page 8 of the Office Action.

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17676

Application No.: 10/689,877

Page 7

interface to receive output data from a remote video game program in another apparatus that is remote and spaced apart from the apparatus; and a second bidirectional communication interface to send input data to the remote video game program.” Claim 16, as amended, requires a machine readable medium including, *inter alia*, “instructions for receiving high-bandwidth information from a remote video game program in a device that is remote and spaced apart from the medium over a first bidirectional communication link; and instructions for sending the low-bandwidth information to the remote video game program over a second bidirectional communication link that has a lower associated latency than the first bidirectional communication link.”

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 16, and as explained above, Fig. 3 of Long et al. shows “a typical computer system 20” (paragraph 0018), which is generally unitary (e.g., found in a single enclosure). In any event, there is no disclosure in Long et al. of “receiving video information at a first apparatus from a remote video game program in a second apparatus that is remote and spaced apart from the first apparatus,” as set forth in claim 1. Independent claims 8 and 16 contain similar recitations. Long et al. fails to anticipate claims 1, 8, and 16 for at least this reason.

Further regarding claim 16, it also requires, *inter alia*, “a second bidirectional communication link that has a lower associated latency than the first bidirectional communication link.” Page 2 of the Office Action provides no evidence from Long et al. that communication link 30' has a “lower associated latency” than communication link 30, as required by claim 16. Indeed, page 2 of the Office Action only alleges that the second link 30' is “different than” the first link 30. This is not what is claimed, and Long et al. fails to anticipate claim 16 for at least this additional reason.

Dependent claims 3-5 and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 and 16.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 2, 6, 7, 9-15, and 19, the addition of Smith et al. or Joyner et al., even if it were proper, fails to cure the deficiencies of Long et al. noted above. Neither of these applied reference teaches or suggests, for example, “receiving video information at a first apparatus from a remote video game program in a second apparatus

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17676

Application No.: 10/689,877

Page 8

that is remote and spaced apart from the first apparatus" and all the additional recitations of claims 1, 8, and 16.

Regarding claims 21-25, these claims as amended require a media center including, *inter alia*, "a wireless communication interface to receive video data from a remote video game program resident in a device remote and spaced apart from the media adapter; a wired communication interface to send real time control data to the remote video game program; and an input interface to receive the real time control data for the remote video game program from a game controller." No reasonable combination of Zuliani et al. and Sony teaches or suggests all limitations of the claimed media adapter.

Page 6 of the Office Action alleges that Zuliani et al. teaches or suggests the claimed wireless communication interface and input interface, and page 7 alleges that Sony teaches or suggests the claimed wired communication interface.

Zuliani et al., however, fails to teach or suggest that Hub 4 includes a "remote video game program," as set forth in amended claims 21-25. The programs in Hub 4 are decidedly not real-time interactive, contrary to the claimed "video game program." Zuliani et al. also fails to teach or suggest that set top unit 10 receives "real time control data for the remote video game program from a game controller," as required by amended claims 21-25. The universal wireless remote 12 does not send control data for a video game program.

Moreover, Sony fails to teach or suggest that the telephone line 2 "send[s] real time control data to the remote video game program." To the contrary, page 8 of Sony teaches only that the telephone line "periodically sends information about your receiver and Access Card to your service provider." The combination of Zuliani et al. and Sony fails to teach or suggest all limitations of the media adapter set forth in claims 21-25 for at least these reasons.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 20-25 are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Alan Pedersen-Giles, attorney for Applicants, at the number below to discuss such matters.

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P17676

Application No.: 10/689,877

Page 9

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 9, 2007



Alan Pedersen-Giles
Registration No. 39,996

c/o Intel Corporation
LF2
4040 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, VA 20151
(703) 633-1061